



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,145	04/21/2004	Yuh-Cherng Wu	13906-122001 / 2003P00271	5096
32864	7590	06/04/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			PESIN, BORIS M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2174		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/04/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/829,145	Applicant(s) WU, YUH-CHERNG
	Examiner BORIS PESIN	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 3/13/2009.

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 3/13/2009, Claims 1, 6, and 11-15 were amended. This action is made **Final**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAP Wizard Builder (NPL provided by the applicant in IDS called Screen Shots of a Wizard Builder sold by SAP AG, 7 sheets) in view of Kodosky et al. (US 4901221).

Re claim 1, SAP Wizard Builder substantially discloses a method to be executed as part of a process for creating an executable configuration program that comprises multiple steps that are successively executed and wherein associated with each of the steps are user-selectable options, the method comprising: creating a rule that during execution of the configuration program determines which of the user-selectable options for a step are displayed when a specified user-selectable option of a previous step is selected; and binding the rule to the specified user selectable option so that during execution of the configuration program the rule is executed when the specified user-selectable option is selected (rule created and binded to execute the rule binded to the specific option when user selects the user-selectable option as claimed above is shown in figures 4-7 for example, also see annotation in figure below). SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose storing the rule in a repository and binding it in the repository. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to store and bind the rule in the repository, since such a modification would have involved the mere application of a known technique such as storing programming to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination

of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

SAP does not specifically teach generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step, (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area and wherein the step and the previous step are arranged in the logic flow area and the user specifies the rule in the refinement area, and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields. Kodosky teaches generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step (See Figure 2), (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area and wherein the step and the previous step are arranged in the logic flow area and the user specifies the rule in the refinement area (See Figures 57, Each box allows for a specific rule for the step), and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields (See Figure 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify SAP and include a logic flow area, a refinement area, and a rule template area with the motivation to provide the user

with a simpler method of creating the logic flow and to allow the user to more easily create a rule for execution.


Re claim 2, note that SAP Wizard Builder discloses a method wherein the binding of the rule to the specified user-selectable option is performed by virtue of a designer selecting a user-selectable option for which to create the rule (inherent, since pages 4-7 show that the user-selectable options are set as created by the designer).

Re claim 3, SAP Wizard Builder substantially discloses a method further comprising: creating a textual explanation of the step that describes available user-selectable options for the step; and binding the textual explanation to the step so that during execution of the configuration program the textual explanation of the step is displayed (see annotated figure below for example). SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose storing the textual explanation in a repository and binding it in the repository. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to store and bind the textual explanation in the repository, since such a modification would have involved the mere application of a known technique such as storing programming to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination

of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Re claim 5, note that SAP Wizard Builder discloses a method further comprising evaluating the stability of a configured software application by executing the software application using a simulated user-selectable option (see page 3, execute in diagnosis mode for example).

User-selectable options steps displayed	Textual explanation of the step
---	---------------------------------



Re claim 6, SAP Wizard Builder substantially discloses a system comprising: a computer network (inherently used to execute the wizard builder); a service delivery device coupled to the network, the service delivery device including a processor and memory storing instructions that, in response to receiving a first type of request for access to a service (inherently used to execute the wizard builder), cause the processor to: create an executable configuration program that comprises multiple steps that are successively executed and wherein associated with each of the steps are user-selectable options; create a rule that during execution of the configuration program determines which of the user-selectable options for a step are displayed when a

specified user-selectable option of a previous step is selected; and bind the rule to the specified user-selectable option so that during execution of the configuration program the rule is executed when the specified user-selectable option is selected (rule created and binded to execute the rule binded to the specific option when user selects the user-selectable option as claimed above is shown in figures 4-7 for example, also see annotation in figure above). SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose storing the rule in a repository and binding it in the repository. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to store and bind the rule in the repository, since such a modification would have involved the mere application of a known technique such as storing programming to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

SAP does not specifically teach generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step, (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area and wherein the step and the previous step are arranged in the logic flow area and the user specifies the rule in the refinement area, and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields. Kodosky teaches generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step (See Figure 2), (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area and wherein the step and the previous step are arranged in the logic flow area and the user specifies the rule in the refinement area (See Figures 57, Each box allows for a specific rule for the step), and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields (See Figure 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify SAP and include a logic flow area, a refinement area, and a rule template area with the motivation to provide the user with a simpler method of creating the logic flow and to allow the user to more easily create a rule for execution.

Re claim 7, note that SAP Wizard Builder discloses a system wherein the memory stores instructions that, in response to receiving the first type of request, cause the processor to bind the rule to the specified user-selectable option by providing an

ability to select a user-selectable option for which to create the rule (rule created and binded to execute the rule binded to the specific option when user selects the user-selectable option as claimed above is shown in figures 4-7 for example, also see annotation in figure above).

Re claim 8, SAP Wizard Builder substantially discloses a system wherein the memory stores instructions that, in response to receiving the first type of request, cause the processor to: create a textual explanation of the step that describes available user-selectable options for the step; and bind the textual explanation to the step so that during execution of the configuration program the textual explanation of the step is displayed (see annotated figure above for example). SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose storing the textual explanation in a repository and binding it in the repository. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to store and bind the textual explanation in the repository, since such a modification would have involved the mere application of a known technique such as storing programming to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications

necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Re claim 10, note that SAP Wizard Builder discloses a system wherein the memory stores instructions that, in response to receiving the first type of request, cause the processor to evaluate the stability of a configured software application by executing the software application using a simulated user-selectable option (see page 3, diagnosis mode for example).

Re claim 11, SAP Wizard Builder substantially discloses a computer-readable storage device comprising instructions (inherently used for displaying and using the Wizard Builder) that, when applied to the machine, cause the machine to: create an executable configuration program that comprises multiple steps that are successively executed and wherein associated with each of the steps are user-selectable options; create a rule that during execution of the configuration program determines which of the user-selectable options for a step are displayed when a specified user-selectable option of a previous step is selected; and bind the rule to the specified user-selectable option so that during execution of the configuration program the rule is executed when the specified user-selectable option is selected (rule created and binded to execute the rule binded to the specific option when user selects the user-selectable option as claimed above is shown in figures 4-7 for example, also see annotation in figure above). SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose storing the rule in a repository and binding it

in the repository. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to store and bind the rule in the repository, since such a modification would have involved the mere application of a known technique such as storing programming to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396).

SAP does not specifically teach generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step, (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area and wherein the step and the previous step are arranged in the logic flow area and the user specifies the rule in the refinement area, and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields. Kodosky teaches

generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step (See Figure 2), (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area and wherein the step and the previous step are arranged in the logic flow area and the user specifies the rule in the refinement area (See Figures 57, Each box allows for a specific rule for the step), and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields (See Figure 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify SAP and include a logic flow area, a refinement area, and a rule template area with the motivation to provide the user with a simpler method of creating the logic flow and to allow the user to more easily create a rule for execution.

Re claim 12, note that SAP Wizard Builder discloses a storage device including instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to bind the rule to the specified user-selectable option by providing an ability to select a user-selectable option for which to create the rule (see pages 4-7 for example).

Re claim 13, SAP Wizard Builder substantially discloses a storage device including instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to: create a textual explanation of the step that describes available user-selectable options for the step; and bind the textual explanation to the step so that during execution of the configuration program the textual explanation of the step is displayed (see annotated figure above for example). SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose storing the

textual explanation in a repository and binding it in the repository. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to store and bind the textual explanation in the repository, since such a modification would have involved the mere application of a known technique such as storing programming to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Re claim 15, note that SAP Wizard Builder discloses a storage device including instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to evaluate the stability of a configured software application by executing the software application using a simulated user-selectable option (see page 3, diagnosis mode for example).

Claims 4, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAP- Kodosky in view of Watson-Luke et al. (20050114240).

Re claim 4, SAP Wizard Builder-Kodosky substantially discloses a method as set forth in claim 3 above SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose wherein creating the textual explanation comprises translating the textual explanation into at least one different language. However, Watson-Luke et al. teaches of wherein creating the textual explanation comprises translating the textual explanation into at least one different language (see paragraph 0297 for example). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have wherein creating the textual explanation comprises translating the textual explanation into at least one different language of Watson-Luke et al. on the method of SAP Wizard Builder-Kodosky in order to provide different language support.

Re claim 9, SAP Wizard Builder-Kodosky substantially discloses a system as set forth in claim 8 above SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose wherein the memory stores instructions that, in response to receiving the first type of request, cause the processor to translate the textual explanation into at least one different language. However, Watson-Luke et al. teaches of wherein the memory stores instructions that, in response to receiving the first type of request, cause the processor to translate the textual explanation into at least one different language (see paragraph 0297 for example). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have wherein the memory stores instructions that, in response to receiving the first type of request, cause the processor to translate the

textual explanation into at least one different language of Watson-Luke et al. on the system of SAP Wizard Builder-Kodosky in order to provide different language support.

Re claim 14, SAP Wizard Builder-Kodosky substantially discloses a storage device as set forth in claim 13 above. SAP Wizard Builder does not explicitly disclose when executed by the processor, cause the processor to translate the textual explanation into at least one different language. However, Watson-Luke et al. teaches of when applied to the machine, cause the machine to translate the textual explanation into at least one different language (see paragraph 0297 for example). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have when applied to the machine, cause the machine to translate the textual explanation into at least one different language of Watson-Luke et al. on the article of SAP Wizard Builder-Kodosky in order to provide different language support.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571)272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Boris Pesin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174